The Community Development Commission met on Thursday, October 5, 2006 in the City Council chambers located at 221 East Main Street, Round Rock, Texas. The meeting was called to order at 6:36 pm. The following commissioners were present for roll call: Karen Adair-Murphy, Ricardo Guzman, Steve Laukhuf, Lee Moore, Dina Schaefer, and Martha Chavez.

<u>**3.**</u> Approval of Minutes: December 5, 2006

The chair called for a motion to approve the December 5, 2006 minutes. Commissioner Schaefer noted she would abstain from voting since she was absent at the last meeting.

<u>Motion</u>: Commissioner Murphy moved to approve the December 5, 2006 minutes as submitted. Motion was seconded by Commissioner Guzman.

Vote: Ayes: Karen Adair-Murphy

Lee Moore

Martha Chavez

Rick Guzman

Steve Laukhuf

Noes: None

Absent: None

Abstain: Dina Schaefer

Motion carried.

<u>Item 4A:</u> <u>Consider presentation regarding the Home Repair Program.</u>

Ryan made the staff presentation. This item was tabled at the December 5, 2006 meeting. The cost estimates were reviewed and non-essential items removed. This resulted in a difference of \$27,472.69. Five properties came in under \$20,000, one being a Priority 1. Seven properties are over \$20,000, but less than \$30,000. Four properties remain over \$30,000; one over \$50,000; and one over \$60,000. A comparison survey was completed with other cities that receive CDBG funds and have similar single family rehab programs:

1	San Marcos	no limit	Their rehab program is handled through a subrecipient who supplements with matching funds.
2	Piano	no limit	70% of A V = reconstruction
3	Abeline	65,000	Plus lead abatement costs. The 65K is effective 3-1-07
4	San Antonio	50,000	Note: no more than \$37.00/sq.ft. + costs for lead abatement
5	Irving	50,000	Plus lead abatement costs
6	Austin	50 000	Plus another \$10K for lead abatement when required; \$80K for historic properties + \$1 0-\$15K for lead abatemet; <i>in the <u>process</u> of <u>increasing</u> to <u>\$100K</u>. NOTE: It takes a minimum of \$40K to bring a property to standard condition in Austin.</i>
7	Lubbock	42,000	\$42K PLUS any lead abatement costs
8	Corpus Christi	40,000	Plus lead abatement costs
9	Ft Worth	00,000	In the process of increasing limit to \$50K to cover the rising costs of construction
			labor and materials with a 10% discretionary increase for lead abatement.
10	New Braunsfel	,	Combines CDBG and HOME
11	Harlingen	25,000	If the standard inspection form determines a rating of over 65%, the applicant will be considered for reconstruction assistance or referred to the Harlingen Community Development Corporation (HCDC) for possible assistance through their Replacement Housing Program. (HCDC's Replacement Housing Program requires the owner of the property to voluntarily demolish the structure)
12	Dallas		Repairs might include: Foundation, air conditioning, roofs, plumbing, heating sewer, and electrical. Homes are also assessed for lead Based Paint hazards and hazards are addressed.
13	Bexar County	25,000	Limited to \$25,000 due to procurement procedures required at County level
14	Bay town	25,000	If the home cannot be adequately repaired for \$25,000, reconstrution is recommended. The limit for a 2-bedroom reconstruction is \$47,000 and \$53,600 for a 3-bedroom. These amounts do not include the cost to demolish the existing unit
15	Amarillo	25,000	Plus lead abatement costs
16	Arlington	24,500	3 mo residency requirement
17	Beaumont	24,000	Includes any lead abatement
18	Rou nd Rock	20,000	Plus lead abatement costs
19	Mission	20,000	Reconstruction maximum is \$50K
20	Allen	15,000	Allows flexibility within a couple thousand dollars
21	Brownsville	14,500	Aged and disabled only
22	Carrollton	4,000	Emergency repair only

Ryan stated that most cities are struggling to keep up with construction costs and have found it necessary to increase their funding caps, according to each city's program representative interviewed by staff.

Item 4B: Consideration and possible action on recommendation regarding the Home Repair Program

Commissioner Guzman left during Item 4B to attend another meeting. Ryan made the presentation. Staff recommends amending the Home Repair Program guidelines by increasing the amount of funding from \$20,000 per property to \$40,000 per property.

Applications for home repairs were taken during a 30 day period in July, 2006. Twenty-five applications were received and processed; out of which 18 were determined income eligible to participate. An independent consultant was hired in October to develop the scope of work for each property. Two out of the 18 properties can be repaired under \$20,000. The remaining 16 properties exceed the \$20,000 cap. Costs to repair these homes range from \$21,000 to over \$62,000.

Additionally, 5 of these properties must be classified as "reconstruct" because the cost of repairs exceeds 40% of the appraised improvement value.

One home cost to repair >\$60K

One home cost to repair >\$50K

Average cost to repair 10 homes (\$20K range): \$24,543

Average cost to repair 4 homes (\$30K range): \$34,889

Two homes cost to repair <\$20K

Funds needed to address the current need: \$530,236

CDBG Home Repair Program funds: \$325,129

GAP \$205,106

The chairman opened the floor for discussion. Commissioner Murphy had reservations about some of the repairs scheduled to be done and said she had expected more items to be deleted. She also voiced concerns about apparent

deferred maintenance on the part of some homeowners. After much discussion, the commission was split on their opinions about the increase in funding; however, a consensus was reached to change the recommended increase from \$40,000 to \$25,000. The chairman called for a motion.

<u>Motion</u>: Commissioner Schaefer recommended amending the Home Repair Program guidelines by increasing the amount of funding from \$20,000 per property to \$25,000 per property. Motion was seconded by Commissioner Moore.

Vote: Ayes: Karen Adair-Murphy

Lee Moore

Dina Schaefer

Steve Laukhuf

Noes: Martha Chavez

Absent: Rick Guzman

Abstain: None

Motion carried.

This is considered a substantial amendment and requires a 30 day comment period. Ryan said a Notice of a 30 Day Comment Period would be posted accordingly.

5. Adjournment:

Being no further business discussion, the meeting adjourned at 7:30 pm Respectfully submitted,

Mona Ryan,

Community Development Coordinator